Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are present in this application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in

condition for allowance.

§ 103(a) Rejection - Yajima, Peng

Claims 1-6 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. 2002/0041268 (Yajima, submitted in an IDS) in view of U.S. Patent 6,466,283 (Peng,

newly cited by Examiner). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that the resin-molded frame 500 of Yajima

corresponds to the die-cast frame of the present invention. Applicant disagrees.

The die-cast frame of the present invention has an integral structure comprising outer

frame pieces and at least one or more linkage pieces which are provided for linking the longer

sides of the outer frame pieces to each other to form an aperture space which is enclosed by the

outer frame pieces and the linkage pieces.

To the contrary, the resin-molded frame 500 of Yajima, as shown in Figs. 4 and 10, has a

linearly corrugated rear surface and has no linkage pieces corresponding linkage pieces of the

die-cast frame of the present invention. Furthermore, the resin-molded frame of the cited

reference does not form an aperture space therein.

Thus, Applicant submits that Yajima fails to disclose "wherein the die-cast frame is an

integral structure comprising outer frame pieces having projecting pieces which project toward

the liquid crystal panel and at least one or more linkage pieces which are provided for linking the

longer sides of the outer frame pieces to each other;

an aperture space which is enclosed by the outer frame pieces and the linkage pieces is

formed; and

a space for accommodating the lamps therein is formed by the projecting pieces."

2

MRC/RWD/rc

Docket No.: 1907-0219PUS1

In addition, the upper frame 800 of Yajima is merely mounted and fixed (locked) to the resin-molded frame 500. Yajima does not disclose a die-cast frame having an integral structure comprising outer frame pieces and linkage pieces for linking the longer sides of the outer frame pieces.

Peng describes a frame which comprises four (4) aluminum stiles formed by extrusion which are joined with each other by welding. Accordingly, Peng's frame is also not a die-cast frame having the integral structure according to the present invention.

For at least the reasons above, Applicant submits that Yajima and Peng, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the die-cast frame having an integral structure comprising outer frame pieces having linkage pieces and projecting pieces, and enclosing an aperture space as recited in the instant claims.

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

## § 103(a) Rejections

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima and Peng in view of U.S. Patent 6,476,883 (Salimes).

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima and Peng in view of U.S. Application Publication 20030090864 (Kuo).

Applicant submits that neither Salimes nor Kuo make up for the above stated deficiencies in Yajima and Peng. Thus, at least for the reasons above for claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejections fail to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

Applicant requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

## Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down #48,222 Michael B. Commorato

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Docket No.: 1907-0219PUS1

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant